

**Listening Session 1
McMinville, Oregon
McMinville City Hall
Wednesday, November 6th, 2019**

Summary

- Concerns over funding mechanisms for housing needs analyses, infrastructure improvements, technical assistance, and construction for smaller communities. Many also wonder how current infrastructure can keep up with density, and how to pay for it.
- Concerns over absentee landlords amassing rental properties and the need for short-term rentals law enforcement
- Hopes that model code will be “loose” enough to allow flexibility for siting, and design standards of local jurisdictions. ADUs should also be included into the conversation.
- Hopes for proactive CC&Rs in counties, precluding future urbanization

Table 1

Concerns

- Money for short-term rental law enforcement
- Increase in short term rentals, decrease in affordable housing, which turns to less inventory
- Not enough middle market inventory
- Too much high end and low end
- Regional dynamics are very different, not affordable
- Hidden costs of HOA (utilities)
- College students – rentals
- Parking takes up land
- ADUs
- Can infrastructure keep with density?

Questions

- Does housing needs analysis include college students?
- Will there be net zero requirements for new homes?

Table 2

Hopes

- Maybe developers will build cottages and town homes

- Cottage clusters, hopefully
- 1 or 2 bedroom rentals
- Conversion of older homes to duplexes, etc.

Concerns

- Standards for blighted areas
 - Converting large lot houses to multi-family
- New design standards for existing detached
- Intent of the bill (HB 2001). Does that match what developers will do?
- Single-family as conditional use in following zones. Is middle housing allowed?
 - Commercial zones
 - Institutional zones
 - Public zones
- Infrastructure
- Development agreement – master plan. Underlying zoning is single family
- Parking
- # of bedrooms

Questions

- Must the city allow same # of parking as single-family?
- Can reduced parking lots be available for duplexes?
- Can allow off-site parking for middle housing?
- New construction? Don't forget the blighted areas. Financing has to be different, with partnerships

Table 3

Hopes

- DLCDC needs to get in front of outcome with building community so that brunt isn't placed on cities
- Model codes should be "loose" enough to allow local control of design, siting, and mass

Concerns

- Duplexes on every lot may exceed infrastructure capacity. Are there guardrails to limit amount of duplexes?
- Unintended consequence of seeing less density than planned capacity?
- Concern about infrastructure study timing and what happens at the end of extension. Approving permits for at-capacity areas?
- IBSTER "reasonable time" for adoption of middle housing codes
- State provisions not working for local jurisdictions
- Legislative intent of this bill was to create inclusive neighborhoods. Presentation was about affordability. We need to actualize the "intent of the bills". If we are reporting out to legislature, what are we reporting? Supply? Affordability? Inclusivity? Efficiency?

- OPS 197.276 market reasonable likely to achieve the need
- FUNDING!
- Concerns that this may not address housing supply or affordability

Questions

- What is legislative intent on allowing middle housing in “areas”
- Should city undertake public process to remove ADU parking requirements not that state prohibits? City would need to remove
- Could there be applications for duplexes under ADU provisions? Therefore eliminating parking requirements
- ADUs don’t count as “density” in reporting. What about duplexes, tris, quads, cottage clusters?
 - DCBS should update ADU to be separate category in ???
- What about all the work we have already done?
- Mac is a small “large city”. Infrastructure is not complex, no transit. How do they fund the studies? Let alone the capital improvements?
- Is this creating more demand for the already-stretched resources in Mac?
- Can we optimize the reporting requirement to coincide with other reporting?
- McMinville is an early adopter. Can there be a simplified rulemaking process for early adopters? Can there be an extended early adopter time for compliance with HB 2001?
- Does the city need to go through public process to change ADU parking standards?
- FUNDING! For study? For capital improvements?
- What’s the definition of “areas”
- Rural CC&R’s?

Table 4

Hopes

- More housing means less pressure on rural lands
- Homeownership opportunities
 - Allows income property development, flexibility for families –ends “game playing” with what makes a dwelling – SDC relation to infrastructure – end disconnect
 - Different types of housing for different household needs – promotes happiness, community
- Raise infrastructure to the forefront. Potential for sharing infrastructure resources

Concerns

- If everybody does a duplex the infrastructure will be insufficient
- Infrastructure costs are great, especially for quality
- Lack of agency connectivity to other housing-related programs
- Opportunistic developers build crap, generate reaction

Questions

- How in-depth will model code go? (e.g. lots <5,000 sq. feet)
- Re: promotion/encouragement of different housing types
 - Can there be a coach/mentor to educate communities on opportunities?
 - Regional HNA-potential to unearth partnerships

???

Nuts and Bolts Issues

- e.g. new cuts-metering-laterals
- Problem: bad “story” will eclipse good stories
 - E.g. “barking dog at duplex”
 - Challenge of outreach to community
 - Reclaim a sense of “neighborhood” – density
 - Need for a “hub”- knit together different aspects of problem/solution
- Use existing model code for parking duplex. One per unit, or per bedroom
- Proximity to public transit. Consider future relationship to vehicles.

Table 5

Hopes

- People need help on design standards beyond mass
- One pager(s) on design options
- Technical assistance
- Model code very important. Hope smaller cities can use model code
- Design standards for ADUs as well as more unit developments
- Menu of options for housing choices. Graphics and narrative
- SDC credits, zone credits
- Less regulations so can pencil out, simplifying regulations
- Technical assistance grants for smaller communities and/or consultants
- Model code that emphasizes design standards, adoptable but flexible
- Development community education
- Software improvement
- Re: CC&Rs → lot restrictive wouldn't be retroactive
- Proactive CC&Rs in counties, precluding future urbanization
- Small, community based financing

Concerns

- Absentee landlords, many who serve section 8, taking up housing
- How is this affecting property value?
- How will this affect supply?
 - Increase affordability, increase supply

- If adds to the appeal (more people), could increase value
- McMinnville becoming unaffordable. Growth going towards west
- Median income lending limits. 200k limit
- Yamhill market > Portland market. Salem market new employers, less expensive than Dallas
- Change in general, new folks coming in
- Apartment complex design standards ugly
 - Site plan review opportunity
- Most communities have no resources to grapple with design.
- Existing code for small cities too brief on ADUs
- Infrastructure- how to pay?
- Duplex. Parking concerns
- 3 or 4 plex. SDC concerns
- Cities need to be flexible with fees to make projects work

Questions

- Is absentee owner-occupancy still in effect?
- McMinnville. Up or out?
 - Cottage cluster R/T multi-family
- How to promote capital investment?
- Can jurisdictions delay SDCs?
- SDC credits or reimbursements?
- Zone of benefits?
- Effective date of current CC&R provisions

???

- Why devalue S/D

Community Conversation #2
 Medford, Oregon
 Medford Public Library
 December 10, 2019

Summary

- Hopes: that we would listen to people actually in the affordability crisis (ex/homeless); SDCs would take on a flexible, form-based approach, that can change as markets change; State resources for planning work, technical assistance dispersed promptly
- Concerns: infrastructure for unincorporated areas, clarity around enforcement of statutes and rules; siting and design standards; keeping leaders committed to the process

Table 1

Hopes	Concerns	Questions
More options, more density at the local level	Keeping leaders committed	Will legislative intent get watered down in the rulemaking process?
In this process, listen to people actually in the affordability crisis	Cities will resist	What is the enforcement behind the housing production strategies?
Keep voices of those struggling in the picture		How will success be defined? Benchmarks?

Table 2

Hopes	Concerns	Questions
Hope that reporting can be streamlined (HB 2003)	Recently-adopted cottage cluster code allows for less units than bill says (800 vs. 1200) [City of Medford]	HB 2003: Could regional HNA replace an individual HNA?
	Siting and design regulations, locational concerns	
	Renewable energy concerns	

Table 3

Hopes	Concerns	Questions
SDCs need to be tied to bedrooms, bathrooms, and take on a form-based model	We may be approaching from too broad a point-of-view rather than being creative, out-of-the-box. Model code may not understand roadblocks yet.	Can we provide data to view housing trends, affordability trends, and what people actually want to buy?

	SDCs need to be managed in order to be affordable for developers.	
Re-structuring of SDCs, simplify them, make them more flexible, affordable for developers	Cautious of over-regulation (ex: UGB, environmental regs)	What can we do in this rulemaking process to close affordability gap this time around? For all people, at all incomes, at all stages in life? Not just increase housing supply?
Hope in the rulemaking		Can we re-structure SDCs?
Hope that we can educate communities and cities on the impact of the bills.		How do we reach more under-represented people with this information?
Funding for technical assistance and consultants for HNAs.		
Creating a roadmap with recommendations for tools and resources to get through HNAs for cities, laid out from beginning to end. Hope that this addresses developer's needs		
Emphasis on funding and resources for HNA		
Form-based code that can be flexible and shifted as markets change		
HNAs need to be straightforward		

Table 4

Hopes	Concerns	Questions
Maximize land to bring unit cost down	Price of land is not adjustable through policy	Ashland: would they need to re-adopt codes if they move forward early? ADU parking requirements?
Ashland has many tools to incent housing. (Ex: annexation ordinance, bonuses for affordability, zoning process relaxed for affordability)	Townhomes are difficult to sell in Central Point. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> White City townhomes for \$200,000. Eagle Point lot bare land is \$40,000 	Will development codes retroactively grandfather in existing duplexes if they are torn down and rebuilt?
Regionalize housing/land use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10% increase in development costs year over year 	What about elderly populations? Will there be renewed demand for middle housing types for them?

Involve counties to regulate land use locally	<u>Building department</u> Creating undue delay and expense	How does this tie into SB 608? Are there additional regulations to come?
Affordable housing on public lands is a great incentive for cities to build subsidized units	<u>County Issues</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connection to City services • Unincorporated urbanized areas • Annexed into City to access City infrastructure 	What does the bill mean as “unreasonable cost or delay”?
	<u>SB 100</u> Statewide planning program’s implications on housing haven’t been addressed	Will rules be adopted to put a cap on review timing?
	Sale of middle housing to landlords/investors is quick, high demand to purchase.	

Table 5

Hopes	Concerns	Questions
Helps with NIMBYism	Housing production strategies need most work. They are not a product for missing middle housing. There’s a lack of innovative financial tools	BOLI requirements with commercial construction (5 th floor triggered). Does this allow for local definition?
HNA data becomes more reliable, accessible, especially for rentals	Allowing duplexes anywhere is not harmless	Alternative forms of tenure such as: boarding houses, single room occupancy. Will there be building code changes?
Tax allocation revenue	Located with proximity to services can be a double-edged sword. This lets single-family neighborhoods off the hook.	
Loan options for buyers of middle housing		
Connection between missing middle and building codes. Ex: sprinkler tax credit (Minnesota)		
Decrease parking requirements		
Prioritize locating housing on transit routes		
Workforce development for building trades, which is currently under-capacity		

Table 6

Hopes	Concerns	Questions
Homes for everyone	Clear siting for tiny houses	Tools in HPSs. Will they really be used?
Local control – allow flexibility from Salem	Enforcement of statute and rules	How “real” will regional housing #s be?
Housing for those making less	Local governments not looking at alternative futures (scenario planning)	Will regional housing “allocations” be enforced?
State helps local governments with planning	Too much money spent on long range planning	How much of the homelessness population are local governments tracking?
More legislation encouraging density	Tax abatement for companies, not home builders	
Minimum density requirements for HPS		
Other required tools for HPS. ex: density bonuses, inclusionary zoning		
DLCD rules on HPSs will include private sector involvement		
Will provide significant # of smaller, affordable units		
Notify the affected property owners		

West Portland Community Conversation
241 SE Edgeway Dr, Beaverton, Oregon
Portland Community College – Willow Creek Campus
Wednesday, January 29th, 2020

Summary

- Concerns about infrastructure improvements and timelines and technical assistance. Many also wonder how current infrastructure can keep up with density, and how to pay for it
- Concerns that HB 2001 and 2003 will not comprehensively address housing affordability and need and will perpetuate historic inequities
- Concern that HB 2001 may negatively impact housing design and historic structures
- Hopes that HB 2001 will provide well-designed housing choice that is more affordable and can accommodate a variety of individual needs and life stages
- Hopes that HB 2001 will provide jurisdictions and communities sufficient flexibility to ensure housing siting and design standards meets the needs of their communities

Hopes

- Housing for people/adults with autism/cognitive disabilities and more severe disabilities (KMS example)
- Reduce the cost for lower income people
- I'm excited to see the beginning of this grand experiment. I hope it will move us closer to being a state where clean, safe, affordable housing is available to all.
- That the HB 2001 changes actually result in more housing choice – that builders will really build the range of housing types
- No infill without mandatory garage space
 - 1-2 bedrooms = 1 garage space
 - 3+ bedrooms = 2 garage spaces
- Establish mandatory setbacks that allow a small skip loader (back hoe) into the back yard (6-8 feet between)
- Protect/respect home rule (2 entries)
- Use consistent state and federal housing data/metrics [e.g. PIT, Consolidated Plan] (e.g. Washington County)
- Monitor production, see what works
- Work with developers to come up with creative solutions that provide greater overall housing stock
- Density with great design!
- Will help create housing my kids can afford in my neighborhood (+1)

Concerns

- Isolation without well-designed supportive group living

- Legislation doesn't take adequate account for sanctioned homeless camps, emergency shelters, transitional housing (housing first strategies)
- How to incent capital/bank/investor to build housing (w/ rent control)
- Wetlands inside UGBs (low value wetlands)
 - If removed LVW from being mitigated
- Mitigating \$\$\$ 47M Albany + no credits (!)
 - Outside UGB still impacting farmland (can't farm it)
- I worry that historic structures will be replaced with shoddy new construction.
- Balancing significant natural resource protections with needed housing
- Forget the fantasy of giving up cars (tax large ones/vehicles)
 - By weight and gas mileage (all cars)
- Because much housing is owned by investors & corporations, no matter how much housing you produce, it will continue to be bought by investors who keep prices artificially high. How can you pass legislation that limits this?
- Disaggregate by race to ensure not perpetuating historical inequities especially including homeless populations (PUMS?)
 - Monitor tactics also by race
- Cities should be allowed to require parking (additional) when a SFR is densified.
- On-site parking exemption
- Perception of 'punishment' for lack of infrastructure
- 2001 – Loss of privacy due to "plex" next door
- 2001 – Loss of home value due to loss of zoning protection
- 2003 – capture of lowest priced housing by large investors

Questions

- How to build respectful communities.
- Compel HOAs to respect people with disabilities, clubhouses, other gathering places
- How does this apply to inside UGB – County lands?
- Contesting development (appeals) – low bar/anyone can – delay, additional expense (outright use should not be challengeable)
- Gaps between Portland RIP and 2001
- Timing of 2003 adoption – sooner than 2022?
- Is it possible to incentivize adaptive reuse of existing housing stock?
- How does the middle housing requirement relate to density (both min + max?)
- Historic districts – How are they affected? – use
- Comments: DLCDC staff fantastic!
- Standardize housing needs analysis to include pockets of unincorporated urban lands
- Existing CC&Rs restricting missing middle? Still viable?
- Timeline for infrastructure planning and improvements

East Portland Community Conversation
7738 SE Harmony Rd, Milwaukie, Oregon
Clackamas Community College – Harmony Campus
Thursday, January 31st, 2020

Summary

- Concerns that HB 2001 may not adequately address the need for both market rate and subsidized affordable housing and barriers preventing their development
- Concerns that infrastructure, parking, and other services in developed areas may not be sufficient to accommodate infill development associated with middle housing
- Concerns about timeline, funding, and clarity regarding various provisions of HB 2001 and HB 2003
- Hopes that the bills will enable the development of middle housing in a manner that increases housing affordability, protects natural features, provides jurisdictions review authority, maintains neighborhood compatibility, and retains existing housing stock.
- Hopes that HB 2001 will provide well-designed housing choice that is more affordable and can accommodate a variety of individual needs and life stages

Hopes

- Equal Emphasis on building “community” – not just buildings.
- ODOT be responsible for water drainage problems they create(d) on Hwy 99 and River Road
- That tree canopy and green spaces are preserved and increased
- That HB 2001 happens ASAP (1 dot)
- That we view affordable housing as important as schools, parks, and roads (1 dot)
- Lot of opportunity to work with existing homes
- Reduce homelessness to the extent that 2001 encourages new housing development and promotes affordability
- Increase housing affordability at all income levels by increasing supply
- Greater infill and expand UGB
- Middle housing requirements should distinguish between existing “built out” areas and new “undeveloped” areas (1 dot)
- Focus housing along transit lines (TOD) transit-oriented development
- Tree preservation
- Affordable housing with neighborhood character
- Stormwater management

Concerns

- ORS 195.065 fails to define “sufficient” urban services
- No assurances for affordability
- “ “ that new housing will provide ownership opportunities
- What mechanisms exist to prevent displacement of low-income families due to redevelopment?
- Lack of infrastructure in unincorporated areas – parks, transportation, storm water

- Supportive housing for mental health, drug addiction, houselessness (2 dots)
- How to involve unincorporated areas? (1 dot)
- Communities will use infrastructure as an excuse to delay
- Equitable targets need to be set for affordable housing. Currently, subsidized housing is inequitable. Here are numbers of subsidized homes: Oregon City (610), Wilsonville (449), Lake Oswego (76), West Linn (10)
- Meeting the housing needs of unincorporated urban areas (1 dot)
- Cost of providing new housing (land, labor, material, regulation, SDCs) all moving in the wrong direction
- Middle housing is a necessary part of the solution to housing affordability – as are any policies that promote supply side.
- The requirement for completing the RNA should await the results of the 2020 census so the most current and accurate data is used (1 dot)
- Changing the character of established single family neighborhoods with out of character “middle housing”
- Providing state funding to assist local governments with identified infrastructure deficiencies (1 dot)
- 900 sq ft footprint for cottage cluster, hard for accessible/no stairs, can still fit 4/acre houses
- Loss of tree canopy
- Neighborhood character
- Rental housing cost. How are we going to increase/support lower cost housing
- Stormwater > flooding

Questions

- Who defines criteria for
 - Housing need analysis
 - Housing production strategies
- Why does HB 2001 require middle housing before housing needs and housing production strategies are completed?
- Why are housing needs and housing production strategies recommended but not required?
- What local power will remain to approve/not approve housing?
- To what degree can the state, counties, or cities incentivize middle housing, over simply regulating it? (2 dots)
- What are realistic protections of housing stock turnover?
- Condominiums and warranties – what barriers are created to condo development by warranties? How might this affect middle housing?
- Barriers in ownership/maintenance models – e.g. HOAs and condominiums for internal conversions?
- Single-room occupancies – what is the feasibility and potential barriers?
- How will terms such as “discourage” and “unreasonable cost or delay” be defined? (1 dot)

Hermiston Community Conversation
1705 E Airport Rd, Hermiston, Oregon
Umatilla County Fairgrounds
Monday, February 10th, 2020

Summary

- Community members expressed a desire for greater Eastern Oregon representation during the rulemaking process.
- Small communities (less than 10,000 in population) in Eastern Oregon are interested in details about HB 2001 rulemaking and compliance as well as technical assistance funding for HNAs.
- Provisions in HB 2001 and HB 2003 should consider market, regulatory, and financing factors and barriers that contribute to the production of housing or lack thereof.
- Community members expressed concern about the adoption of standards that diminish local jurisdictions' ability to regulate siting, design, and infrastructure of middle housing and to plan for housing growth.
- There is interest in the Regional Housing Needs Analysis methodology and how findings will be useful to Eastern Oregon communities.

Hopes

- Hermiston, easier to excavate, easier to build, because flat land, infrastructure close by
- Cities <10k probably need the technical assistance grant more than cities >10k
 - Neighboring cities of similar size can team up for analysis
 - How can we use information from HNAs/HPSs that have already been done so we are not creating too much work for smaller cities?
- ODOT has a small city allotment grant program offering \$50,000-100,000 for road maintenance activities for cities less than 5,000 in population
 - DLCDC should have a similar grant program that offers a meaningful amount rather than the relative pittance of our small city/small county grant program
- GO Bond
- Consider travel/transportation costs
- Boardman has had seven duplexes in the past three years; townhouse apartment
- In Pendleton, expectation of 30-40 new townhouses and duplexes constructed over the next couple of years
- Pendleton does have existing duplexes
- Eastern Oregon representation for HNA and RHNA and Economy and Housing
- Parking for ADU's and Duplexes
- There is a lot of demand for temporary worker housing and higher end housing
- Boardman "sweet spot" seems to be in in the \$185,000-\$285,000 range
- Umatilla Community Development Director - new townhouse subdivision project just approved. He needs a good example, visual, to share with the community. Part of "selling" the project
 - Providing examples of attractive middle housing will be important for communication during implementation
- Hopes that HNA technical assistance will be extended to cities below 10,000 population

- E.g. Milton Freewater has an outdated HNA and lack of resources to update
 - The UGB poses a significant barrier to providing housing
- Umatilla County – interested in coordination on behalf of small (under 10,000) cities
- A focus on new construction rather than conversion

Concerns

- Hot market works against affordability. Developers will inevitably place burden onto cost of housing, increasing affordability
- SDCs, slopes, land, rock barriers, natural hazards, restrict land development in Pendleton
- Lack of affordable lots in Pendleton. All of the affordable land is outside the UGB
- HNA EOA made up of smaller communities. Either one has antiquated data. Use local information
- Boardman is quickly approaching a population of 10,000
 - Understand jobs as important as housing
 - Employers are coming in but there is no housing
 - Limited number of contractors and builders. This limited pool of labor has been strained further by recent flooding
- Lack of labor to construct housing
 - Many contractors quit during the recession
- Transient housing needs compete with motel rooms and rentals
- AirBnB in Pendleton
 - A lot of RV's or converted sheds.
- In Pendleton, higher end housing needs were being felt from unmanned aircraft activities taking place at the Pendleton Airport where employees are making \$90,000/year or more
 - Have infrastructure capacity
- Loss of parking for ADU. There is some interest in developing ADUs but not necessarily in locations of the city with adequate infrastructure
- ADU Parking and lot coverage
- In Pendleton, many of the lots in the city are very steep and likely not suitable for duplex development. The Pendleton Round-Up reduces parking abilities in nearby neighborhoods because event parking spills over to residential parking
- A studio in Boardman costs \$850; a 2-3 bedroom costs \$1100 - \$1395
- Parking is problematic. What is city responsibility? Focus more on new development rather than conversion. Lack of housing people (personnel) available in region to help
- Population growth forecasts by PSU often have incorrect assumptions
 - E.g. PSU had originally overestimated the prison population around Umatilla and later corrected
- Concerns about ADUs with no on-site parking and conversion of single-family residential
 - More vehicles in Eastern Oregon
- Infrastructure is typically based on anticipated development
- HPS – Avoiding a one-size fits all approach
 - SDC Credits are often not viable for smaller jurisdictions
- Umatilla, Stanfield and Echo have brand new HNA's. Only Umatilla has adopted

Questions

- How do we incentivize builders to build at price points that are lower when construction costs are high? What is going to fill in the gap? Grants? Land donations? TIFs?
- Do these bills assume there's available land to build on, without expanding UGB?
- Does this bill assume we are coordinating with utilities already?
- What is "affordability"? Does it take into account lack of utilities/infrastructure, costs that developers may have to shoulder onto residents?
- Reporting for Boardman communities
- Is Eastern Oregon represented on RHNA? How will regions be defined?
- What if the RHNA shows need for housing but the city under 10,000 does not have money to implement accommodation of that need?
- How does the RHNA link with tribal lands?
- What is required for cities with adopted HNAs? How to accommodate?
- Are the metrics of how the RHNA worked in California?
- How do we induce builders/developers to have a lower profit margin? Real problem is affordable housing lots. How to create an environment where we sell housing for lower costs? Incentives?
 - OHCS did offer 10% loan guarantee in Pendleton. But they are not using this program.
 - OHCS does not have tools to service housing other than "low income"
 - Happy to have another "low income" project in Pendleton
 - Hayden Homes relies on volume of units produced
 - "DLCD wants us to do infill. Give tax credit to offset lower rents"
- Umatilla is growing quickly; it will likely reach a population of 10,000 in a few years. What is the timeline for implementation of HB 2001 and 2003 when a city reaches a population of 10,000?
 - Note: Umatilla already amended code to allow duplexes in all but one residential zone
- IBTER – What is the City responsible for? What will the developer provide?

Redmond Community Conversation
243 E Antler Ave, Redmond, Oregon
Redmond Public Works Building
Tuesday, February 11th, 2020

Summary

- Community members discussed details about the Regional Housing Needs Analysis methodology and how the findings might support regional collaboration in economic development and the provision of housing.
- Community members have many questions and concerns about how specific provisions and rules of HB 2001 will affect local jurisdictions' ability to regulate the siting and design of middle housing.
- Many middle housing types are currently permitted in Central Oregon jurisdictions. Much of the groundwork related to code updates and community familiarity with middle housing types has already been laid in these communities.
- Members had both hopes and concerns about HB 2001 successfully allowing and incentivizing the development of smaller-scale and more affordable housing types.

Hopes

- RHNA Housing study – Potentially useful as a tool to guide conversations with larger companies seeking to locate in a region.
 - Could help with regional 'silos' in which each City is focused within its UGB. May allow for collaborative planning and resource sharing.
 - Could serve as an underpinning for how to accommodate growth regionally
- HPS: Communication and information sharing for jurisdictions will be important for successful implementation.

Concerns

- “We have housing, it’s just too expensive.”
- Perception that builders are holding back a bit waiting for prices to climb higher
- Developers are reluctant to put together big crews because of the way so many of them got stung during the recession.
 - Limits their capacity to quickly finish projects.
- Bend BLI Discrepancies with what types of land do and do not count as buildable
- Redmond – Commuter characteristics and trip patterns
 - The City is in need of more detail about where people are going
 - Privacy data makes collecting this information impossible – overcoming this challenge will help bridge an important data gap
 - Getting this information will inform how housing relates to commuter characteristics

Questions

- Redmond Sewer Master Plan – Limits development of certain areas

- Will the regional strategy address this?
 - It could free up land that is currently not available for development
- Prineville – Anticipates much of the code is near compliance with HB 2001
 - Question about how minimum lot size standards apply in the minimum standards.
- Question about codes, covenants, and restrictions (CCRs). Answer: new ones are prohibited but old ones are contracts that will remain.
- IBTER timeline – Are the deadlines the time to apply or the time to address? Answer: the former
 - What is considered “deficient”?
- RHNA – Are the regions defined? Answer: They are limited by existing ACS data.
 - Will the upcoming Census have an impact? Answer: No, the statutory deadline is September 2020.
- How is middle housing represented in existing development codes?
 - Prineville: Historical pattern of single-family development, but changing due to increased demand and changing preferences. There has been an increase in the variety of housing types produced. Feels HB 2001 will have a negligible impact
 - Single-family is desirable for some people
 - HB 2001 takes away a tool the City uses to control development (e.g. hazard areas)
 - Redmond: Has a need for more of all housing types. Feels that area planning guiding greenfield development and development of middle housing has eased community angst
 - The fine detail work is key – Carefully considering how a neighborhood is structured; what does it mean to have a neighborhood that meets resident’s needs?
 - When is ADU counted in density calculations?
 - Bend: Has areas that will be redeveloped. New standards – while not adopted by larger scale developers – may provide options to smaller scale developers such as inheritors of property or aging residents.
 - Creates an incentive rather than mandates development and can change mindsets over time
 - Not enough housing types currently